DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 340 322 HE 025 176

AUTHOR Carlson, Jerry S.; And Others
TITLE Study Abroad: The Experience of American Undergraduates in Western Europe and the United States. Occasional Papers on International Educational Exchange Research Series.
INSTITUTION Council on International Educational Exchange, New York, N.Y.
REPORT NO CIEE-28; ISBN-1-882036-10-7
PUB DATE Oct 91
NOTE 69p.; Abridged version of the original book; edited by Elinor G. Barber and Barbara B. Burn.
AVAILABLE FROM Publications Department, Council on International Educational Exchange, 205 East 42nd Street, New York, NY 10017.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Collected Works - Serials (022)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Career Choice; *College Students; Cultural Awareness; Higher Education; Individual Development; *International Educational Exchange; Private Colleges; Second Language Learning; Social Development; State Universities; *Student Characteristics; *Study Abroad
IDENTIFIERS Kalamazoo College MI; University of California; University of Colorado Boulder; University of Massachusetts Amherst

ABSTRACT

A study was done to examine the effect of study abroad experiences on undergraduate students both in their undergraduate years and afterwards. The study was a joint effort of U.S. and European educators and institutions, involved over 400 participants, and included a comparison group of students not undertaking a year abroad. The participating U.S. institutions were the University of California, the University of Colorado at Boulder, the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, and Kalamazoo College, Michigan. Results indicated that those who choose to study abroad and those who do not differ in predictable ways in cultural interest and domestic orientation; that not only academic but social and personal development are important parts of the international experience; that the time abroad has a significant impact on foreign language facility; that participants in the study abroad programs score higher than the comparison group on cultural interest and peace and cooperation indicators; that foreign systems of education meet with mixed responses; and that in later career choices none regretted their study abroad. Included are 13 tables, appendixes listing European coordinators, guidelines for occasional papers on international educational exchange, 28 published titles, and a list of 39 references. (JB)

ED340322

OCCASIONAL PAPERS 28

On International Educational Exchange

RESEARCH SERIES

Study Abroad: The Experience of American Undergraduates in Western Europe and the United States

By Jerry S. Carlson
Barbara B. Burn
John Useem
David Yachimowicz

Abridged version of the original edited by

Elinor G. Barber
Barbara B. Burn

HE 025 176

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
CIFE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

2

Council on International Educational Exchange

Council on International Educational Exchange

The Council on International Educational Exchange is a private, nonprofit, membership organization, incorporated in the United States with international offices, affiliations, and representation. CIEE, founded in 1947 by a small group of organizations active in international education and student travel, was established to restore student exchange after World War II. In its early years CIEE chartered ocean liners for transatlantic student sailings, arranged group air travel, and organized orientation programs to prepare students and teachers for educational experiences abroad. Over the years CIEE's mandate has broadened dramatically and its activities and programs abroad have spread beyond Europe to Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Today CIEE develops and administers a wide variety of study, work, and travel programs for American and international students at the secondary, undergraduate, graduate, and professional levels.

Study Abroad: The Experience of American Undergraduates in Western Europe and the United States

by

Jerry S. Carlson
Professor of Education
University of California at Riverside

Barbara B. Burn
Associate Provost for International Programs
University of Massachusetts at Amherst

John Useem
Professor Emeritus of Sociology
Michigan State University

David Yachimowicz
Professor of Education
University of California at Riverside

This abridged version of the original book edited by

Elinor G. Barber
Assistant Provost
Columbia University

and

Barbara B. Burn

October 1991

Council on International Educational Exchange
205 East 42nd Street, New York, NY 10017

Copyright © 1991
by Jerry S. Carlson, Barbara B. Burn, John Useem, and David Yachimowicz
ISBN: 1-882036-10-7

Table of Contents

Foreword v

Preface vii

Chapter 1: Research Questions and Methodology 1

Chapter 2: How Do Students Who Study Abroad Differ from Those Who Remain on Their Home Campus? 5

Chapter 3: Study Abroad Experiences 11

Chapter 4: Language Development During Study Abroad 17

Chapter 5: Changes in International Perspectives 25

Chapter 6: Academic Issues 29

Chapter 7: Personal and Sojourn Variables Related to Outcomes of Study Abroad 37

Chapter 8: Looking Back on Study Abroad 41

Chapter 9: The Significance of the Study's Findings: Policy and Research Implications 47

References 55

Appendix I:
European Members of the SAEP Team 59

Appendix II:
Occasional Papers on International Educational Exchange 61

Foreword

The need to adapt the programs of colleges and universities to equip students to function in our current global society has become evident to all. Sending students to study in another culture seems to be an obvious way to achieve this goal. Until now only a small amount of research has documented that study abroad is a powerful tool for preparing students for our interdependent world.

This study stands as a landmark in research about the effects on students of a sojourn for study. With data on over 400 participants from four institutions in the United States and 30 institutions in four countries in Europe, it has an unmatched breadth.

The project includes information on 71 students who had studied abroad from 5 to 15 years before the project was carried out. This provides some understanding on the lasting effect of a year abroad. Perhaps most notably this research involves a reasonable comparison group of students who did not study abroad. This, more than anything, allows one to understand what is unique about education in another culture. The results given here will be of significant value to those responsible for developing and operating education abroad programs.

Henry D. Weaver
former Deputy Director, Education Abroad Programs
University of California at Santa Barbara

Preface

The number of American undergraduates who study abroad has increased significantly in the last decade. More and more students believe that a study abroad experience will enrich their undergraduate education and their personal development. They hope also that such an experience will enhance their career opportunities, particularly their chances of pursuing internationally-related careers. At the same time, the educational benefits of study abroad are increasingly recognized by faculty and administrators in American colleges and universities. In the current widespread concern to reassess general education and liberal education, study abroad is receiving new attention because of its potential for expanding students' analytic abilities, their awareness of cultural diversity, and their capacity to deal with ambiguity.

Study abroad has benefited from positive assumptions about its effects and suffered from the lack of systematic research about its actual contributions to undergraduate education. Little is known about the conditions under which all students or certain students profit most from study abroad, and in what ways they profit. The Study Abroad Evaluation Project (SAEP) was launched in 1982 to undertake the kind of systematic and comprehensive research needed to understand the role of study abroad and to give guidance to educational policymakers. The study focused on what difference, if any, study abroad makes to students as undergraduates and in their later lives. Four kinds of effects of study abroad are examined: (1) students' proficiency in foreign languages; (2) their knowledge of and concern about other countries and cultures and international issues; (3) their knowledge of and attitudes towards their home country; and (4) their career objectives and accomplishments.

Part of the impetus for the SAEP came from the 1978–79 President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. The Commission's report, *Strength through Wisdom*, emphasized the contribution of study abroad and other kinds of overseas training and research to international education. After some preliminary discussions between U.S. and European educators with common interests in study abroad, a group of U.S. institutions and the European Institute of Education and Social Policy (Paris)

agreed in 1982 on a joint Europe-United States research project on study abroad, the SAEP.

To ensure as much comparability as possible between the European and U.S. sides of the study, it was stipulated that the selected U.S. institutions have the following characteristics: (1) their study abroad activities include Western Europe; (2) the U.S. institutions, like the European ones, integrate most if not all of their students into the host institutions abroad; (3) the U.S. programs involve reciprocal exchanges with institutions in Europe; and (4) they have data on study abroad covering a decade or more.

The U.S. institutions selected on the basis of these criteria were the University of California, the University of Colorado at Boulder, the University of Massachusetts at Amherst (which was also the coordinating institution on the U.S. side), and Kalamazoo College. Kalamazoo's study abroad programs lack some of the stipulated characteristics (full integration and reciprocity), but as a small, private, midwestern liberal arts college, it makes the SAEP more broadly representative of study abroad in American higher education.

The participating European institutions, nearly 30, are located in the United Kingdom, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, and Sweden. They include not only universities but a range of other postsecondary institutions. The European institutions offer a total of over 40 study abroad programs and the U.S. institutions offer 12 (counting all the programs of one U.S. institution in a given country as a single program).

Scope and Generalization Limitations

The study deals only with the effects of study abroad on U.S. students, not with the effects on European students. As for the matter of generalization, first, the narrow selection criteria that contribute to the study's systematic rigor mean that the relevance of the findings to study abroad programs that don't share the stipulated characteristics cannot be assumed, even though it may be substantial. For example, the U.S. study abroad programs included in the project were overwhelmingly academic year, not semester or summer, programs. Second, the SAEP could not, for the most part, establish correlations between program features of study abroad programs and their effects on students' international learning. Finally, the response rate to our surveys (which will be discussed further below) made it more appropriate, for the most part, to aggregate data across host countries and institutions and across home institutions.

Acknowledgements

The following individuals were extremely important to the U.S. side of the project: William H. Allaway, University of California; Jean Delaney, University of Colorado at Boulder; Joe Fugate, Kalamazoo College; Maryélise Lamet, University of Massachusetts at Amherst; Elinor Barber, a coauthor, Institute of International Education; Patricia Martin, University of Pennsylvania; and Horst Hoffman, University of California, Riverside.

The U.S. participation in the project would not have been possible without the support of the U.S. Information Agency. The role of the European Institute of Education and Social Policy was indispensable in implementing the SAEP. The European team members are listed in Appendix I.

Chapter 1:
Research Questions and Methodology

As universities and colleges throughout the United States renew and expand their interest in the international component of undergraduate education, study abroad programs will become a factor of increasing significance. International educational exchange has a long history (Burn, 1985), but the research literature (see, for example, Brislin, 1981; Church, 1982; Klineberg, 1982; Klineberg and Hull, 1979; Spalding and Flack, 1976; Sell, 1981; Weaver et al., 1987) has not been systematic and few investigations have employed longitudinal, quasi-experimental designs.

In the present study, by contrast, questionnaires were administered to students who studied abroad, before their departure and after their return. Questionnaires were also administered to a comparison group of students who did not study abroad. Finally, the long-term impacts of study abroad were explored through in-depth telephone interviews of alumni/alumnae of the four U.S. institutions who studied abroad between five and fifteen years ago.

The research questions guiding the study were:

1. Who chooses to study abroad? Or, how do students who study abroad differ from those who remain on their home campuses?
2. What changes occur in the two groups of students (study abroad and comparison group) over the time span of the junior year?
3. What characteristics of the individuals and/or the sojourn abroad contribute to variation in the changes observed?
4. What are the long-term effects of the study abroad experience? How pervasive and durable are they?

To address these research questions, two subject cohorts were used: one cohort (the study abroad group) was surveyed in connection with the first three research questions; a second cohort (the study abroad alumni/ae) was used to address the fourth question. For Cohort 1, a comparison group design was used.

Cohort 1 consisted of students who had been chosen to participate in year-long study abroad programs, beginning in autumn 1984. As mentioned earlier, they came from the four American institutions participating in the study, the University of California, the University of Colorado, the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, and Kalamazoo College, and were to study in four European countries: France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom , or Sweden. The comparison group consisted of students only from the University of California (only the Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara campuses, since their student bodies are generally representative of the University of California as a whole) and from the University of Massachusetts who chose not to study abroad but met the academic criteria (3.0 grade point average, sophomore status) for doing so. The comparison sample was randomly selected from this population.

Questionnaires were administered to Cohort 1 and the comparison group twice: at the end of the sophomore year (spring, 1984) and at the beginning of the senior year, when all study abroad students had returned to their home campuses (fall, 1985). The numbers of post-sophomore year questionnaires distributed to and returned by the study abroad and comparison groups are reported in Table 1.

Table 1
Numbers of Pre-Junior Year Questionnaires Distributed and Number and Percent Returned

	Distributed	Returned	%
France	291	192	66%
West Germany	137	135	99%
Sweden	20	17	85%
United Kingdom	201	144	72%
Comparison	820	355	43%

Inspection of Table 1 shows that the response rates for the study abroad group averaged 80 percent. This figure, while extraordinarily high for questionnaire return rates, is not surprising. Students on the eve of a study abroad year are likely to be highly motivated to comply with requests from officials of their institutions to complete a pre-departure questionnaire (Carlson and Yachimowicz, 1987). The response rate for the comparison group was, as one would also expect, much lower, with 43 percent of the students responding.

The numbers of students who completed both the spring 1984 and fall 1985 questionnaires are given in Table 2.

Table 2
Number of Fall '85 Questionnaires Distributed and Percent Returned

	Distributed	Returned	%
France	291	102	35%
West Germany	137	69	60%
Sweden	18	5	28%
U.K.	201	75	37%
Comparison	310	157	51%

Examination of Table 2 shows that the response rates for the study abroad students after their sojourn averaged around 40 percent. This response rate provides a suitable basis for generalizations (Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1975). At 51 percent, the response rate for the comparison group was somewhat higher than for the study abroad group.

Cohort 2 was made up of individuals who graduated from the four U.S. institutions between 1960 and 1981 and who as juniors spent a year abroad in one of the four target European countries. There were 77 such persons interviewed. Cohort 2 received a short questionnaire followed by a detailed telephone interview.

Chapter 2:
How Do Students Who Study Abroad Differ from Those Who Remain on Their Home Campus?

Demographic Characteristics of Cohort 1: Study Abroad and Comparison Groups

The average age of the study abroad group was 20.7 years; the average age of the comparison group, likewise, was 20.7 years. The gender distribution for the study abroad group was 31 percent male, 69 percent female; for the comparison group the figures were 39 percent male and 61 percent female. Although approximately 16 percent of both groups reported that either their mother or father had been born outside of the United States, almost all of the students themselves were born in this country. Neither group reported an earlier extensive experience in living abroad. Those students who reported that their family, or a member of their family, had previously lived abroad (approximately 30 percent of each group), indicated that the overseas sojourn was of short duration and usually part of a military assignment.

The study abroad and comparison groups did not vary appreciably in the socioeconomic or educational levels of their parents. The general level of education of the parents of both groups was high: 48 and 43 percent of the study abroad and comparison students, respectively, reported that their fathers had completed at least a master's degree. The educational level of the students' mothers, while lower than that of the fathers, was also relatively high (the median educational level was a Bachelor of Arts) and approximately the same for the two groups. In their academic interests, the study abroad participants departed substantially from those of students who remained at their home campus. The study abroad group was made up largely of students majoring in the humanities and social sciences, business, and education (81 percent reported majors in one of these areas). Only 19 percent of the study abroad students majored in the sciences or mathematics. By contrast, and not surprisingly, the majors reported by the comparison group represented the range of majors found in the student populations from which they were selected, with approximately 60 percent majoring in the humanities, social sciences, business,

and education, and 40 percent majoring in the sciences, mathematics, and engineering.

The reasons given by students from both groups for choosing their majors were fairly similar. The most highly rated factor was interest and perceived ability to succeed in the subject matter. Both groups also rated career and job-related factors highly, if somewhat less important, and comparison group students tended to rank career-related reasons for choosing a major slightly higher than the study abroad group did. While this finding might be explained by the significant difference in the patterns of major areas of study of the two groups, data gathered as part of this investigation suggest that the study abroad students, at least prior to their foreign experience, tended to be less set in their career choices than their stay-at-home counterparts. Both groups had good records of academic achievement, and both tended to rate themselves substantially above average in academic accomplishment, revealing themselves to be realistically confident in their ability to succeed in an academic environment.

Parental financial contributions did not constitute the sole source of support for either the study abroad or the comparison group. In the study abroad group, only 59 percent of total university expenses were underwritten by the students' parents; income from the students' own work, grants, loans, and scholarships made up the rest. The figures for the comparison group are similar, except that these students tended to receive somewhat more parental support (64 percent of their costs were born by the parents) than did the study abroad students. These results provide clear evidence that, on average, the stay-at-home students are less dependent on various sources of financial aid apart from their parents than are the study abroad students.

Knowledge and Interest in Other Countries

As one would expect from academically capable and confident college students, all respondents indicated high levels of interest in other countries, current events, and foreign affairs; student sojourners, however, had even higher levels of interest in these areas than the comparison group. Students used, primarily, television and domestic newspapers and magazines to gain information about other countries . Indeed, about two-thirds of all the respondents relied primarily on these media for their knowledge of other countries. Less than one-third of the students reported that their main source of information was books published in the United States. Only eight percent of the study abroad students indicated that foreign newspapers or books published in foreign countries were used as sources of information; of the comparison group, only about three percent used such materials.

Attitudes Towards Other Countries and the United States

The predeparture attitudes of the study abroad group towards other countries were assessed by asking for their opinions about certain aspects of the country in which they were going to study; students in the comparison group were asked to give opinions about whatever foreign country they knew best, which was generally a European country. The two groups of students were then asked to express their opinions about the United States on the same dimensions. The aspects in question ranged from postsecondary education to foreign policy to customs and traditions to social structure. The means and standard deviations for the two groups are shown in Table 3.

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations for Study Abroad and Comparison Groups Concerning Attitudes Toward a Foreign Country and the U.S.

	Foreign Country Mean (SD)	**United States Mean (SD)**
Post Secondary Education		
Study Abroad Group	2.18 (.73)	2.14 (.89)
Comparison Group	2.21 (.93)	1.83 (.74)
Government Foreign Policy		
Study Abroad Group	2.72 (.79)	3.42 (.98)
Comparison Group	3.01 (.98)	3.05 (1.05)
Cultural Life		
Study Abroad Group	1.71 (.73)	2.33 (.89)
Comparison Group	1.97 (.93)	2.05 (.87)
Media		
Study Abroad Group	2.52 (.87)	2.55 (1.09)
Comparison Group	2.69 (.97)	2.31 (1.03)
Customs, Traditions		
Study Abroad Group	2.00 (.76)	2.59 (.87)
Comparison Group	1.96 (.82)	2.58 (.90)
Social Structure		
Study Abroad Group	2.72 (.93)	2.74 (.92)
Comparison Group	2.59 (1.06)	2.66 (.95)

Scale:
1=Highly Positive Opinion ←——————→ 5=Highly Negative Opinion

The two groups had similar opinions in a number of respects: for example, about the customs and traditions of the United States and of the foreign country, about the media in the two countries, and about social structure. But several interesting contrasts between the study abroad and comparison groups emerge from Table 3. Thus, while the postsecondary education system of foreign countries was viewed equally positively by both groups, the comparison group valued the U.S. system of postsecondary education more highly than did the study abroad group. In several other respects, the study abroad group was more favorably disposed towards their chosen foreign country and less favorable to the United States than the comparison group. The study abroad group was more negative about U.S. foreign policy than about the foreign policy of their selected host country; the opposite was true of the comparison group in comparing U.S. foreign policy and the foreign policy of "their" foreign country. While the cultural life of the foreign country was assessed positively by both groups, the prospective sojourners were significantly less positive about cultural life in the United States than the comparison group was.

While one can only speculate about these findings, it seems as if study abroad students, even with little foreign experience and specific knowledge of the country in which they expect to study, have positive "mind-sets" toward that country and its institutions. The source of this mind-set is unclear; it may derive, at least in part, from somewhat critical views of certain U.S. institutions and corresponding assumptions that things are surely better elsewhere. If this is the case, it suggests dynamic tensions between pushes away from the United States and pulls toward the foreign country.

Why—and Why Not—to Study Abroad

The sharpest differences between the study abroad group and the comparison group emerge, not surprisingly, in explaining why members of these respective groups are motivated or not motivated to study abroad. For the study abroad students, the most important reasons behind their decisions to study abroad include a desire for foreign cross-cultural experiences, the improvement of foreign language ability, a desire to live in and make acquaintances from another country, an interest in gaining another perspective on their home country, a desire for travel, and a deeper understanding of a particular host country. Ranked just below these items was the expectation that the study abroad experience would improve career prospects. Of only moderate importance in the students' decision to study abroad was the opportunity to become acquainted with subject matter not offered at their home institution. Of even less importance were that friends also were going on study abroad programs

or that the study abroad experience might help establish ties with one's own family or ethnic heritage.

The comparison group students were asked how interested they were in studying abroad. Only 23 percent had little or no interest, and as many as 66 percent indicated they were moderately willing to commit time and money to study abroad. When queried further about their reasons for not studying abroad, 50 percent indicated that it was unnecessary for their course of studies, 40 percent suggested that it would be inappropriate for their majors, and 46 percent thought that study abroad might delay their graduation. In short, the primary reasons for studying abroad are the students' desire to experience new cultures and to learn the language of the host country. Academic reasons appear to be of secondary importance.

This suggests that greater numbers of qualified and academically able students would participate in study abroad programs if they were perceived as more clearly related to the students' academic programs and the institutions' curricula, underscoring the importance of integrating study abroad programs into the academic core of the university.

Career Perspectives and Study Abroad

It was clearly not possible to compare study abroad students and the comparison group with respect to perceptions of the relationship of study abroad to the students' realization of internationally oriented careers.

A substantial number of study abroad students noted that career plans were a significant factor in their decision to study abroad. Between 20 and 25 percent of them planned on careers in international business and viewed the upcoming experience abroad as almost essential to their career development. A very high proportion of the students, between 87 and 95 percent, felt they would be able to utilize the general aspects of their international experience in their later professional life. Over 50 percent of these students indicated that their careers would most likely involve some sort of international contact; and somewhat fewer than 50 percent expected that their careers would involve living and working in foreign countries.

International Understanding

Intensive analysis of the questionnaires administered to the study abroad and the comparison groups, using a method called step-wise discriminant analysis, showed that five variables contributed independently to differences between the two groups in international understanding. It is important to note that international understanding should not be considered static; rather, it is time and place dependent and the product of a complex set of dynamic interactions

that involve one's orientation to changing circumstances and events. The five variables that contributed to differentiation between the two groups of students were:

(a) "Cultural Interests," defined by the students' awareness of problems common to many nations, concern for problems of the Third World, need for closer cooperation among nations, etc.

(b) "Domestic Orientation," a composite variable defined by attitudes involving restriction of immigration of foreigners to the United States, the importance of duty towards the United States, the significance of patriotism and loyalty, etc.

(c) Participation in international clubs.

(d) Academic learning styles: organized approach to studies, analytical abilities, degree of intellectual independence.

(e) Interest in current events and international affairs.

The study abroad group scored significantly higher than the comparison group on Cultural Interests, their participation in international clubs, the self-discipline and independence that characterized their learning style, and their interest in current events and international affairs. The most salient factor differentiating the study abroad students from the comparison group students was Cultural Interests. The second most salient variable accounting for differences between the groups was Domestic Orientation. The study abroad students were higher in the Cultural Interests scores and lower in their Domestic Orientation scores than the comparison group. The combination of just these two composite variables provides a relatively powerful model for predicting who is and who is not likely to study abroad.

Although we have no data on how differences develop between the study abroad students and students who remain on their home campuses during their junior year, we do have strong indications that the students differ in predictable ways. Further research is needed to address questions such as how students' interests in other cultures develop and how students' perceptions of study abroad are shaped.

Chapter 3:
Study Abroad Experiences

Unlike most efforts to assess the effects of study abroad experiences, the Study Abroad Evaluation Project (SAEP) was designed to make it possible to find out (1) in what respects and to what extent changes occurred in the study abroad group and (2) how these changes differ from those that occurred in the comparison group of students who did not go abroad. The design makes it possible to relate the changes in the study abroad group to their various overseas experiences and to explain more and less satisfactory outcomes, in part, at least, by the academic and other experiences of the students.

Information on the students' study abroad experiences was obtained through the post-study abroad questionnaire, administered in the autumn of 1985 to students from all four participating U.S. institutions. The number of respondents per country in which the students studied was as follows: France, 102; the United Kingdom, 75; the Federal Republic of Germany, 69; and Sweden, 5; for a total of 251.

Accommodations

The American undergraduates who studied in Europe had a variety of different living situations, depending on the country in which they studied. In Sweden, West Germany, and the United Kingdom, the majority of the students (upward of 75 percent) lived in university dormitories. In France, by contrast, half of the students resided in apartments or in private homes; only 13 percent of students studying in France lived in university dormitories. Most of the students, regardless of host country, lived primarily with students who were nationals of the country. In France, 21 percent of the students lived with other Americans, a much higher percentage than in the other countries.

Academic Aspects of Study Abroad

While abroad, the majority of the students (66 percent) took at least a few courses which they could not or would not have taken on their home campuses.

Over half (57 percent) reported that they had developed new areas of interest and 68 percent reported that they took courses to broaden their academic and cultural backgrounds. These findings strongly suggest the the experience abroad enabled the students to expand their academic and intellectual horizons beyond what they might have been had the students stayed at home.

The students were asked also to make qualitative judgments about the education they received in their host country. This meant comparing the academic standards of their home and host institutions and providing their perceptions of the academic standards expected of American students as contrasted with host country students. With regard to host country academic standards, the students rated those in West Germany and France lower and those in Sweden and the United Kingdom about the same as the standards at home. Comparing the academic standards expected of American students and those of host country students, the study abroad group felt that less was expected of them, except in the United Kingdom. It may be that the students' judgment of academic standards in France and West Germany was colored by the less rigorous treatment they were accorded. In those countries, also, they experienced greater difficulty in becoming integrated in the host institutions, which may have led them to have somewhat distorted perceptions of local academic standards.

Asked to comment on aspects of their home institutions that they had learned to appreciate more as a result of their sojourn abroad, the study abroad group noted most frequently matters related to the organization of lectures and classes and the use of frequent assignments and evaluations. A few representative quotes follow:

> "Basically, I like the relationship between the student and the teacher. At my home institution, I knew specifically what I was supposed to study each night. Yet in Bordeaux it was left up to the student."

> "I learned to appreciate the grading system and diversity of material at my home institution. I like having my work evaluated throughout the year rather than having everything ride on a final exam."

Comparison group students were asked to comment on those aspects of the junior year at their home institution that they especially liked or appreciated. Their comments tended to focus specifically on the quality of the instructors and organization of classes.

> "Professors are usually very interesting, and the teaching assistants I have had have all been committed to helping me get as much as possible out of the course."

When study abroad students were asked about those aspects of the home institution which they had become more critical of as a result of studying abroad, they often focused on the perception that students were "spoon-fed," treated as though they were not mature, independent learners, and forced to work under the artificial pressure of external rewards such as grades.

> "The rigorous structure, inflexibility and rate at which information is transmitted to students. There is very little time for contemplation or development of individual thoughts regarding a subject."
>
> "Mostly the emphasis on the textbook as a teaching utensil rather than a guideline."
>
> "Spoon-feeding students with what to do, what to read, and what to memorize, rather than making students think for themselves."

The critical comments made by the comparison group students generally focused on problems such as the ten-week quarter at the University of California, large classes, and too much emphasis on factual information. While the study abroad students were somewhat critical of the academic aspects of some their host universities, they tended to think that their general intellectual development during the study abroad period was greater than if they had remained on their home campuses for their junior year. Some of their comments are revealing in this regard:

France

> "Much of my intellectual development came through experiences outside the classroom while I was abroad. The opposite would be true at home."
>
> "I've learned to accomplish more intellectually (to be more critical) in everyday activities."
>
> "It wasn't so much that I learned more in the classes I took over there, but there was a different bias on the information.
>
> "It was quite interesting to learn about U.S. history from a foreign view. Also, just being in another culture and another country you learn a lot."

West Germany

> "Academic accomplishment: much less abroad. Classes met once a week, no reading classes were usually required. Intellectual development: there much more. My horizons broadened considerably. My mind opened to new ideas."

United Kingdom

> "Not only did I really learn to improve my writing (which was already good) due to so much emphasis on papers in England, but associating with so many Europeans tremendously broadened my interest in the European community, their role in world affairs, and history."
>
> "I was tested less, but had to do more private research and write more essays, so although I may have learned fewer "facts," I learned to research and write better, and to study what I choose."

In summary, the study abroad period was an academically and intellectually enriching time. A sizeable minority of the students wished their European stay could have been extended beyond the single academic year and very few wished the stay had been shorter.

Personal Aspects of the Study Abroad Experience

Academics constitutes just one dimension of the experience the study abroad students have. Several other aspects of their lives abroad contribute to the richness of their overall experience. Extracurricular activities like clubs, athletics, social and cultural events, travel, reading, people watching, and discussions with host country students and other nationals are important in helping the students become involved in the foreign culture and provide insight into that culture.

One of the most valuable activities that American students engage in while in Europe is travel. After the period of foreign study has begun, the average time spent traveling is well over 30 days. The amount of travel by the students is fairly consistent, regardless of their European host country. The richness of the experiences that the students gain from travel and the significant role that travel plays in their general development is exemplified by the following comments:

France

> "Fifteen days in Israel at Passover time. I saw a culture and a religion even more apart from that of my own country or host country. Very enlightening and educational."
>
> "A French-affiliated trip to the Soviet Union was a highlight of my total year abroad. The cliché "my eyes were finally opened to reality" applies here—being able to meet Soviet citizens, talk to them in private about their insights on their government, etc., provided me with much to think about, especially reevaluating my feelings of my own country—realizing how extremely lucky I am to be a U.S. citizen."

Sweden

> "Visiting all countries and experiencing their cultures, but especially Eastern Bloc countries. It was important to see both the realities and the Western myths."

United Kingdom

> "I learned to make decisions and live with mistakes. I met lots of people. Learned a lot about art."

In addition to travel, personal interaction with a variety of host country nationals, both students and others, plays an important part in shaping the study abroad experience. Contacts with the teaching staff of the host institution and contacts with fellow American students were considered to be important but of substantially less significance. And contacts with administrative representatives of the home country or with home country faculty were not seen as being important at all. Here are some representative comments:

France

> "The students of the host country. They gave me the fullest opportunity to learn about France and the French."
>
> "My host family because I felt I could get from them the feelings, reactions, etc. of the average French person."

West Germany

> "Students from host and home countries: it is important to talk and learn from them and verbalize my own thoughts."

United Kingdom

> "Students and people of the host country—I totally immersed myself with them—they showed me a portion of their culture I never would have otherwise seen."

The most important medium for personal experience in the host country was conversation with host nationals. Nonfiction, journals, television programs, and lectures contributed only marginally to the students' general understanding and appreciation of the culture and society in which they lived. In sum, the academic aspects of the study abroad year constitute only one dimension, albeit a very important one, of the study abroad experience. Other factors that

contribute substantially are development of personal knowledge, self-confidence, independence, cultural awareness, and social abilities.

The limitations of the academic side of the experience raise some questions that need further examination. Language undoubtedly plays a significant role in this, as well as some major differences between the American system of higher education and the systems of higher education of the Federal Republic of Germany and of France. Since integration into the academic life of the host institution is a stated goal of many American study abroad programs, the issue should be given considerable attention.

Chapter 4:
Language Development During Study Abroad

One of the primary objectives of study abroad, a key objective shared by the students who go abroad and by the institutions that establish study abroad programs, is the improvement of the students' foreign language skills. For example, the Regents of the University of California, in establishing the University's Education Abroad Program in 1961, asserted that, among other goals, the "improvement of the students' communication with all aspects of a foreign society by developing their skills in the use of a foreign language" was of primary importance. The majority of students who study abroad, with the obvious exception of those who study in English-speaking countries, rank the development and refinement of foreign language skills as their top priority goal (Carlson and Yachimowicz, 1987; Prater, Barrutia, Larkin, & Weaver, 1980). The significance of study abroad for the development of foreign language proficiency was emphasized also by President Carter's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, in its 1979 report, *Strength through Wisdom*.

The Tests Used

In examining the effects of study abroad on language proficiency, the SAEP has the great advantage of providing assessments of such proficiency both before and after the overseas sojourn. Two kinds of measurement approaches were used. One is a self-appraisal method developed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS), which consists of "can do" statements by the students' assessment of their language ability in four areas: speaking, listening comprehension, reading, and writing. The items are arranged in a Guttman-like scale, i.e., in an ascending order of difficulty. The task of the individual completing the scale is to indicate those items that he or she can do quite easily in the foreign language at issue. Tables 4 –7 show their proficiency in the four domains, as well as their self-appraisals on these scales before and after their study abroad experiences in France and West Germany.

Table 4

Self-Appraisal of Verbal Ability Prior to and After Study Abroad

	French		German	
Speaking Skill	**Prior**	**After**	**Prior**	**After**
Count to ten in the language	100%	100%	100%	100%
Say the days of the week	99%	100%	100%	100%
Give the current date (month, day, year)	99%	100%	100%	100%
Order a simple meal in a restaurant	96%	100%	93%	100%
Ask for directions on the street	95%	100%	95%	100%
Buy clothes in a department store	91%	99%	84%	100%
Introduce yourself in social situations and use appropriate greetings and leave-taking expressions	88%	98%	86%	100%
Give simple biographical information about yourself (place of birth, composition of family, early schooling, etc.)	96%	100%	98%	100%
Talk about your favorite hobby at some length using appropriate vocabulary	63%	93%	67%	96%
Describe your present job, studies, or other major life activity accurately and in detail	76%	97%	52%	97%
Tell what you plan to be doing five years from now, using appropriate vocabulary	56%	95%	46%	93%
Describe your country's educational system in some detail	49%	87%	46%	86%
State and support with examples and reasons a position on a controversial topic (for example, birth control, nuclear safety, environmental pollution)	36%	78%	25%	73%
Describe the system of government in your country	35%	81%	29%	67%
Mean percent across categories	**77%**	**95%**	**73%**	**94%**

Table 5

Self-Appraisal of Listening Ability Prior to and After Study Abroad

	French		German	
Listening Skill	**Prior**	**After**	**Prior**	**After**
Understand very simple statements or questions ("Hello, how are you?", "What is your name?")	100%	100%	100%	100%
In face-to-face conversation, understand a native speaker who is speaking slowly and carefully (deliberately adapting his or her speech to suit you)	100%	100%	98%	100%
On the telephone, understand a native speaker who is speaking to you slowly and carefully (deliberately adapting his or her speech to suit you)	96%	100%	97%	100%
In face-to-face conversation with a native speaker who is speaking slowly and carefully, tell whether the speaker is referring to the past, present, or future	95%	99%	98%	99%
In face-to-face conversation understand a native speaker who is speaking as quickly and colloquially as he or she would to another native speaker	35%	89%	38%	75%
Understand movies without subtitles	34%	87%	26%	84%
Understand news broadcasts	24%	82%	22%	87%
On the radio, understand the words of a song you have not heard before	10%	38%	18%	45%
Understand play-by-play descriptions of sports events on the radio	10%	39%	11%	48%
Understand two native speakers when they are talking rapidly to one another	23%	81%	27%	68%
On the telephone, understand a native speaker who is talking as quickly and as colloquially as he or she would to another native speaker	11%	74%	15%	57%
Mean percent across skill categories	**49%**	**78%**	**50%**	**74%**

Table 6
Self-Appraisal of Reading Ability Prior to and After Study Abroad

	French		German	
Reading Skill	**Prior**	**After**	**Prior**	**After**
Read personal letters or notes written to you in which the writer has deliberately used simple words and constructions	99%	99%	98%	99%
Read on store fronts the type of store or the services provided (for example, "dry cleaning," "bookstore," or "butcher")	96%	99%	98%	99%
Understand newspaper headlines	99%	99%	91%	99%
Read personal letters and notes written as they would be a native speaker	75%	99%	64%	99%
Read and understand magazine articles at a level similar to those found in *Time* or *Newsweek*, without using a dictionary	51%	97%	30%	97%
Read popular novels without using a dictionary	13%	95%	6%	95%
Read newspaper "want ads" with comprehension, even when many abbreviations are used	31%	91%	23%	91%
Read highly technical material in a particular academic or professional field with no use or very infrequent use of a dictionary	15%	80%	16%	80%
Mean percent across skill categories	**60%**	**95%**	**53%**	**95%**

Table 7
Self-Assessment of Writing Ability Prior to and After Study Abroad

Skill	French		German	
	Prior	After	Prior	After
I cannot really communicate any information in the language of the SAP host country through writing	—	—	—	—
I can write a few sentences in the language of the SAP host country, using very basic vocabulary and structures	—	—	1%	—
I can write relatively simple items (such as a short note to a friend) that communicate basic messages but usually contain a considerable number of misspellings and/or grammatical errors	18%	5%	34%	12%
I can write fairly long personal letters as well as uncomplicated business letters, which convey meaning accurately and which contain relatively few errors, although they are not completely idiomatic in expression	55%	80%	62%	76%
I can write complex personal and business letters, as well as many other kinds of documents (for example, a "letter to the editor" of the local newspaper) using in each case the particular vocabulary and style of expression appropriate to the particular writing situation. There is only an occasional hint that I am not a native writer of the language.	6%	15%	3%	11%
My writing, in all situations, cannot be distinguished from that of an educated native speaker of the SAP host country	—	3%	—	1%

The second kind of measure is an oral interview to assess speaking abilities, which range in competence from that of a novice to that of a native speaker. The interview is carried out by one or two trained testers who have native speaker proficiency and extensive training in the use of this approach. In the case of the SAEP, oral interviews were conducted in German with 33 University of California and University of Colorado students who were to study in West Germany before and after studying abroad.

Language Competency, Before and After

Discussing "before and after" with regard to the study abroad group's language proficiency is not a simple matter, especially the "before" part of the phrase. The complexity results from the fact that the students' self-appraisals of their speaking proficiency before departure are not consistent with the appraisals of those who conducted oral interviews with them. The interviews were based on the system developed by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and the Educational Testing Service (ETS).

The students' self-evaluations (see again, Tables 4 –7) indicate that they considered themselves quite proficient in speaking the language of their prospective host country. The oral interview results (see Table 8) suggest that confidence in the validity of the students' self-evaluations may be misplaced.

Inspection of Table 8 will show that 15 of the 37 sojourners interviewed were considered to be at the Intermediate level ("Able to satisfy some survival needs and some limited social demands").*

Table 8

ACTFL/ETS Oral Interview Scale Levels and Frequencies Prior to Study Abroad

Superior	5
Advanced+	3
Advanced	4
Advanced–	4
Intermediate+	4
Intermediate	15
Intermediate–	2

*The other ACTFL categories are as follows: Intermediate minus — "Able to satisfy basic survival needs and minimum courtesy requirements." Intermediate plus — "Able to satisfy most survial needs and limited social demands." Advanced — "Able to satisfy routine social demands and limited work requirements." Advanced plus — "Able to satisfy most work requirements and show some ability to communicate on concrete topics relating to particular interests and special fields of competence." Superior — "All performance above advanced plus."

Comparison of the data in Table 8 with the before and after self-evaluations found in Tables 4 –7 indicates that the students' assessments of their speaking abilities prior to living abroad are significantly higher than the assessments of the oral interviewers of their speaking proficiency. One probable reason for this inflated self-evaluation is that students who are selected for study abroad have generally had only limited experience in using the language of the host country and have not had the types of foreign language and cultural experiences that would allow them to place their own language proficiency in the context of living and studying in a foreign culture. Changes in the language proficiency of the study abroad group are shown in Tables 4 –7 (the self-appraisals) and in Table 9 (the results of the post-return oral interviews).

Table 9
ACTFL/ETS Post-Study Abroad Oral Interview
Levels and Frequencies

Superior	10
Advanced+	1
Advanced	6
Advanced–	1
Intermediate+	0
Intermediate	2
Intermediate–	0

Inspection of these tables shows substantial increases in language proficiency for each language category. The areas in which the students felt they had attained the highest levels of proficiency were listening, speaking, and reading. Writing continued to provide the students with the greatest difficulty. One reason for this is that the amount of writing (especially evaluated writing) they do in the language of the host country is quite limited. Another reason for the modest gains in writing is probably that writing is the most difficult of the various areas of language acquisition. (Another factor may be the fact that the self-appraisal writing scale is rather restricted. The amount of gain required to move from one level of proficiency to another is more substantial than for the other self-appraisal scales.)

With regard to speaking proficiency after studying abroad, there is far more agreement between the students' self-appraisals and the assessments emerging from the oral interviews (see Table 9): both reveal very substantial speaking

proficiency. What is more, when the results of the oral interviews before and after study abroad are contrasted, they show very significant gains in proficiency. Indeed, if one "averages" out the levels of oral proficiency before and after, it becomes clear that the students moved from rather poor control of the German language to levels of proficiency that are outstanding. To our knowledge, gains in language proficiency of this magnitude have not been documented in language courses which do not involve a sojourn abroad.

These results are impressive and encouraging. Nonetheless, it is good to keep in mind that gains in language proficiency may not be permanent (Campbell & Schnell, 1987). This issue should be included in future work in the area. Another caveat concerns whether the results are applicable to languages other than those assessed in the present study. While the magnitude of changes documented for French and German may be applicable to Spanish and Swedish, it may not be applicable to languages that are substantially more difficult for English-speaking persons, like Japanese, Korean, or Chinese.

Chapter 5:
Changes in International Perspectives

The improvement in language proficiency is exceedingly impressive, but language proficiency is, basically, a means to other ends. As the Regents of the University of California put it, the ultimate objective is "communication with all aspects of a foreign society"—as well as new perspectives on their own country. It is important, therefore, to examine the ways in which and the extent to which the study abroad students acquired new insight into their host and home countries. Comparisons between the study abroad group and comparison group are useful.

Knowledge of International Affairs

Prior to the junior year, most students, whether or not they were to study abroad, showed a moderate interest in other countries and in international affairs. Not surprisingly, the study abroad group's interest in international affairs was significantly greater after their foreign sojourn. The students who remained in the United States also showed higher interest in international affairs after the junior year than prior to it, but the degree of change was greater for the study abroad group. This result is consistent with the expectation that college students generally tend to develop deeper interests in foreign affairs (Sell, 1983).

Knowledge of and Attitudes toward Host Country and Home Country

While the study abroad group's knowledge about their host country prior to their sojourn was poor to moderate, it increased dramatically as a result of having lived and studied in that country. The areas of greatest gain were those that touched the students' lives most directly and were, therefore, most salient to them. These areas included the system of postsecondary education, cultural life, customs and traditions, social structure, and dominant social issues. Changes in the level of knowledge in subjects that were somewhat more distant from the students' personal experience, such as the economic system and the foreign policy, were impressive but of lesser magnitude.

The students' level of knowledge about their host country was not great prior to study abroad, but their opinions about the same aspects of the country were quite positive. For example, in contrast to their level of knowledge, the students' attitudes towards postsecondary education in the country in which they were to study were very favorable, as were also attitudes towards social structure, customs and traditions, and foreign policy. After their return, the study abroad students continued to have favorable opinions about the host country's cultural life and its customs and traditions. Somewhat lower, but still consistent with the views expressed prior to study abroad, were the opinions about the media, social structure, and civic life. In significant contrast to these persisting views was the clearly lower opinion the students came to hold of the system of postsecondary education in their host country. The greatest downward change occurred after studying in France, followed by the Federal Republic of Germany and the United Kingdom.

Prior to the junior year, students in both the study abroad group and the comparison group viewed postsecondary education in the United States quite positively. After their year abroad, the study abroad group viewed U.S. postsecondary education slightly more positively (the difference is not significant statistically), and the comparison group continued to value it highly. The nature of the academic experiences that are related to these more negative opinions will be discussed in the next chapter.

The study abroad group's views of U.S. foreign policy were not very favorable in the first place and became less favorable yet during their sojourn abroad. The comparison group, which was somewhat more favorable towards U.S. foreign policy than the study abroad group both before and after the junior year, became slightly (but not significantly in statistical terms) more negative in the course of the junior year.

The views of the study abroad students toward the media, the social structure, and the customs and traditions of the United States did not change appreciably.

In sum, there were dramatic changes in the study abroad group's level of knowledge about the host country and, with one exception, no great change in its overall positive evaluation of the institutions of the host country. The important exception was the host country's system of postsecondary education.

International Understanding

The variables that contributed most to differences between the study abroad group and the comparison group in the cognitive dimension of international understanding showed some changes after the junior year. These variables were: (a) Cultural Interest and Respect and (b) Peace and Cooperation.

With respect to both these variables, the study abroad group scored higher than the comparison group. In general, the differences detected between the two groups prior to the junior year continued to exist afterwards. Neither group increased significantly in the cognitive aspects of international understanding, although there was a statistically nonsignificant tendency for the study abroad group to score higher on Peace and Cooperation and on Cultural and Social Interest subsequent to the year abroad.

So far as the affective dimension of international understanding is concerned, there appear to be divergencies between the study abroad and comparison groups in Domestic Orientation, both prior and subsequent to the junior year. There seems to be a tendency for the comparison group to be higher in this dimension at the later time; the opposite is true for the study abroad group, which became somewhat less "domestically oriented." No such trend can be inferred for the International Concern factor, although the comparison group appears to have a lower score on this dimension after the junior year than before.

Chapter 6:
Academic Issues

A certain disenchantment with the educational systems of the host countries, especially those of France and the Federal Republic of Germany, has already been noted. We shall explore further in this chapter the sources of this disenchantment, as well as the effects of study abroad on the study abroad group's orientation to academic work.

Problems During Study Abroad

If students studying in a country other than their own have problems, it is important to determine how many of these difficulties arise from adapting to a new culture and to what extent they have to do with the fact that students, wherever they are, have coping problems. Is the foreign student, wherever he or she is, more "student" than "foreign?" (Coelho-Oudegeest, 1971; Walton, 1967).

In their extensive cross-national study of over 2,500 students in eleven countries, Klineberg and Hull (1979) found that the most significant problems that sojourners have are related to language, finances, adjusting to a new educational system, and coping with the customs and social norms of the host country. It has been suggested that students who study in countries whose cultures stand in marked contrast to their own will be more likely to experience problems than students who come from countries more similar to the host culture (David, 1971; Farnham & Bochner, 1982; Hull, 1978; Morris, 1960; Smith, 1955). In the present investigation, the study abroad and comparison groups were asked to indicate the extent to which they had problems during their sojourn abroad or their junior year, particularly academic problems. These included taking courses and/or examinations in a foreign language, academic level of the courses, teaching methods, financial matters, counseling, etc. Analysis shows that two factors accounted for most of the variance:

(a) "Academic Problems," defined as matters having to do with the academic level of courses, teaching and/or learning methods, etc.

(b) "Integration/Life Style Problems," defined by interaction with host country students, counseling, and climate.

As can be seen from an inspection of the mean in Table 10, the study abroad students, on average, did not tend to have significant problems in the areas queried.

While the means and standard deviations for the student sojourners were not shown in Table 10, they were remarkably similar regardless of the country in which they studied. The only exceptions were that the students who studied in France indicated that they had too much contact with other American students and that at French universities administrative matters tended to be somewhat difficult to adjust to. No difference was found between the study abroad and the comparison group on Academic Problems; not surprisingly, the study abroad group had more problems in the Integration/Life Style dimension.

Learning Styles and Abilities

With regard to learning styles, analysis showed four relatively independent dimensions:

(a) "Intellectuality," defined as applying theories or abstract knowledge to practical issues; abstract problem solving, formulating and using hypotheses

(b) "Academic Style," defined by such characteristics as cooperating with others in academic work, articulating own thoughts and views, and choosing tasks commensurate with abilities

(c) "Work Habits," defined as working continuously, having discipline in learning, planning and following through

(d) "Persistence," i.e., assuming a heavy work load, working under time pressure

Before and after their overseas sojourn, the study abroad group scored higher than the comparison group on the first two of these dimensions. While this difference was consistent over time, both groups scored higher on the Intellectuality factor over time. Neither group increased in their Academic Style score over time, however.

The results of these analyses of the learning styles data indicate quite clearly that prior to the junior year, the study abroad students viewed themselves to be somewhat more capable than the comparison group in abstract and hypothetical thinking abilities. Both groups perceived themselves to have increased significantly in these abilities in the time span between the administration of the first and second measures.

Table 10
Principal Factor Analysis of Problems During the Year:
Study Abroad Group

Academic Problems	**I**	**II**	**Mean**	**S.D.**
Academic level of courses too easy	.44	-.09	3.96	1.13
Differences in teaching/learning methods	.53	.03	3.50	1.12
Readiness on part of teaching staff to meet and/or help foreign students	.65	.00	3.85	1.17
Differences in class or student project group size	.65	-.03	4.11	1.11
Administrative matters	.41	.24	3.67	1.23
Financial matters	.40	-.06	4.07	1.10

Integration/Life Style Problems	**I**	**II**	**Mean**	**S.D.**
Interaction among/with host country students	-.19	.66	3.99	1.10
Guidance concerning non-academic matters	.12	.59	4.15	1.05
Guidance concerning academic matters	.35	.47	3.72	1.23
Climate, food, health, etc.	-.08	.37	3.94	1.11

Unrotated eigenvalues of correlation matrix	3.85	0.88
Proportion of variance	.84	16

Scale

1=Very serious problem ——— **5= No problem at all**

Ways of Thinking and Learning

The importance that the study abroad students attribute to certain ways of thinking and learning was measured only after their return from their overseas sojourn, not before departure; the "before" measure is a retrospective one. Table 11 shows the items that students were asked about and the means and standard deviations for the retrospective before and after responses.

Several interesting before and after contrasts emerge. Areas considered to be more important after than before the study abroad experience for the students' learning and intellectual development appear to be: systematic thinking, familiarity with different schools of thought, developing one's own point of view, obtaining knowledge from different disciplines, and independent work. Areas that the students appear to consider less important after their sojourn abroad are learning facts and studying to get good grades.

Personal Self-Efficacy

It has been repeatedly asserted that an extended sojourn abroad can offer the individual challenges and opportunities that result in intellectual growth (Abrams, 1960), expansion of one's "world view" (Sanford, 1962), more positive attitudes toward foreigners (Sell, 1983), enhanced self-concept (Caresello & Greiser, 1976), and greater sociability (McGuigan, 1984). While it is not made explicit, the external source of both cognitive and emotional development is based on "disequilibrating" experiences (see, for example, Allport, 1955; Block, 1982; Festinger, 1957; Luria, 1976; Piaget, 1950). In order for an event to be disequilibrating, there must be a "mismatch" between the individual's level of mental organization and the external event (Hunt, 1965). If the mismatch is not too great, the external event or events can be incorporated into the existing cognitive and affective structures, and can catalyze change as the individual seeks to accommodate to the new information.

Fundamentally important to this process is how one perceives and reacts to particular environmental circumstances and challenges. One of the noncognitive variables of interest to us in the context of study abroad is an individual's personal self-efficacy. Our interest in personal self-efficacy is based on the view that (a) an extended sojourn abroad will positively affect the sojourner's self-concept and (b) one's self-concept is likely to mediate change in several important areas that are affected by the study abroad experience.

The personal self-efficacy scale used here is based on Susan Harter's work (1978, 1986). The two key variables identified through factor analysis were:

(a) "Attitudes Toward Self," defined by such things as the ability to make friends, the sense of doing the right thing, the sense of being a very important member of a group;

Table 11

Means and Standard Deviations for the Importance of Ways of Thinking and Learning: Study Abroad Group

	Before		After	
	Mean	(S.D.)	Mean	(S.D.)
Understanding theories	2.07	(.91)	1.78	(.84)
Applying knowledge to practical areas	2.21	(.96)	1.72	(.81)
Systematic thinking	2.35	(.93)	1.72	(.81)
Methodology (research methodology, computer programming, etc.)	3.01	(1.11)	2.67	(1.20)
Familiarity with different schools of thought	2.52	(.91)	1.72	(.72)
Examining relations between observations/hypotheses/facts/concepts	2.51	(.83)	2.06	(.92)
Obtaining comparative (e.g., international/ European, intercultural) perspectives	2.74	(.91)	1.43	(.62)
Developing one's own point of view	1.95	(.93)	1.43	(.61)
Utilizing publications in a foreign language	3.50	(1.15)	2.47	(.93)
Obtaining knowledge from different disciplines (Interdisciplinary approach)	2.62	(1.00)	2.14	(1.00)
Out-of-class communication between students and teaching staff	2.60	(1.04)	1.80	(.94)
Independent work (e.g. writing papers), project work	2.58	(1.11)	1.88	(.99)
Obtaining regular feedback from teachers	2.32	(1.01)	1.95	(1.01)
Learning facts	2.18	(.86)	2.35	(.96)
Regular class attendance	1.82	(.93)	1.88	(.94)
Studying to get good grades on examinations	1.81	(.93)	2.04	(.96)
Regarding the teachers as the main source of information	2.60	(.96)	3.05	(.95)
Taking on a heavy workload	2.29	(1.06)	2.51	(1.11)
Selecting demanding courses	2.16	(.96)	1.99	(.96)

1=Very Important ← → 5=Not Important at all

(b) "Sociability," which includes the sense of having a lot of friends, being popular, and doing things with a lot of other students.

The mean scores of the study abroad and comparison groups were very similar both before and after the junior year. Accordingly, the expectation that the study abroad experience would result in increased levels of self-confidence and sociability was not supported. Further research is required, however, before this conclusion can be reached with confidence. Such research needs to incorporate a variety of measures both of self-efficacy and of of personal control, which is closely related to perceived self-efficacy and which has been shown to mediate behavior (Bandura, 1982). There is a substantial body of evidence (Lachman, 1986) that suggests interventions like an overseas sojourn do affect an individual's perception of personal control and that enhanced levels of personal control lead to improved and more effective performance in a number of areas. Our findings in this area, then, should be considered provocative but not definitive.

Firmness of Career Goals

After their study abroad experience, the majority of the students involved, regardless of the country in which they had studied, anticipated that they would enter graduate school after receiving their baccalaureate degree. While both the study abroad and comparison groups were more determined or set in their career goals after the junior year than before, the students in the comparison group were even more set in their future career aspirations than those in the study abroad group. The latter are consistently less committed to specific, clearly defined career goals than students who do not participate in study abroad.

As for specific post-study abroad career plans, only a minority of the students expected to use their study abroad experience directly; a majority planned on careers that could be substantially, but indirectly, enhanced by the knowledge and perspectives the sojourn abroad offered.

The students who went to the United Kingdom were the exception to this, perhaps because they had not acquired foreign language proficiency. In general, the returned students felt that their study abroad experience would be highly valuable in enabling them to achieve their professional and/or work-related goals.

A few examples of the study abroad group's career aspirations are the following:

France

"I would like to work in the field of international education or international exchange programs."

West Germany

"To be a professor of economics (international finance, trade)."

"I would like to get a Ph.D. and teach comparative literature."

United Kingdom

"Law/academics."

"Sales or managerial position."

The career aspirations of the students in the comparison group were remarkably similar to those of the sojourners who studied in the United Kingdom. Academically-related career goals were mentioned most often.

Overall Assessment of Effects by Students

The students who studied abroad were very thoughtful and reflective in their responses to an open-ended question about their experience. Clearly, the year abroad was of great significance to them. Some of their efforts to distinguish between different kinds of effects — academic, personal, career-related — are worth noting. Here are some fairly long examples:

France

"I feel that I've grown tremendously from my experience abroad. I think this will help me in all areas of my life, my professional life as well."

"Before going abroad my career goals appeared to be set. After my year abroad I decided to pursue a new major in addition to the old one. I am happy with this decision, had I not gone abroad I might have perhaps haphazardly entered the Foreign Service. Regardless of a future career, if in International Law/Diplomacy/Government or in an unrelated field, I am sure my year abroad helped me grow in some ways years in advance and the experience will help me deal with all situations in the future."

Sweden

"I found that I'm much more adaptable than I might have thought. By the end of the year abroad I really felt like I belonged in Sweden."

West Germany

"I have really been sorting through things in these last weeks, so this survey will give you perhaps the most objective picture. I think the most important thing I learned from my year abroad is that NOTHING,

NOBODY, and NO PLACE is perfect. It seemed I was always searching for perfection and it really struck home that life is a mixed bag when I was abroad. I realized that people were people all over the world—and we all have our quirks. Systems of government stink and shine on every continent—well, you get the idea. It cracked my "happily ever after" complex and it's making my life now a lot more productive for it. Thanks."

"It was the best thing I've ever done. I grew in every way. Seeing the world has widened my knowledge in many areas—from geography to world affairs."

United Kingdom

"I think this will stand out as the best experience of my college years. I just wish there was a resource (or liaison) to help me get back for graduate school. I feel I gained as an individual, through my participation. Despite the weather, homesickness, etc.—I would go through the program again as it proved to be a most rewarding experience."

Chapter 7:
Personal and Sojourn Variables Related to Outcomes of Study Abroad

One of the major objectives of this study was to find out what aspects of the individuals themselves and what aspects of the sojourn contribute to variation in the observed outcomes of the study abroad experience.

Change in Language Proficiency

Seven characteristics of individual students were shown, through stepwise regression analysis, to be significantly related to improvement in language proficiency, which was measured by summing the change scores across the four language competency self-appraisal scales (listening, speaking, reading, and writing). The seven statistically significant characteristics (independent variables) were gender, academic accomplishment while abroad, positive opinion of the host country, increase in knowledge about the host country, level of international understanding (as measured by the "Peace and Cooperation" dimension of the cognitive international understanding scale), level of personal self-efficacy (as reflected by the "Attitude toward Self" factor of the self-efficacy scale), and "Academic Style," a dimension of the learning styles scale assessing cooperative attitudes toward academic work.

The single most powerful predictor of change in language proficiency was gender: the males made the greatest gain. Prior to study abroad, the males were substantially lower than the females in foreign language proficiency; by the end of the sojourn, the males made gains that brought them up to the level of the females.

Four sojourn characteristics were statistically significant predictors of language improvement: degree of integration into the host university, living with or in the company of host nationals, overall judgment of the worthwhileness of the study abroad year, and not associating with other American students.

These results suggest that improvements in foreign language proficiency can be enhanced in a number of ways. Efforts might be made, for example, to

increase students' knowledge of the host country and to facilitate their integration into the host country university and their contact with students from the host country. It may be possible, also, to provide more support to strengthen the students' self-confidence in meeting the challenges of studying and living in a foreign environment.

Satisfaction with the Study Abroad Experience

The study abroad students were very satisfied with their junior year, and there were no appreciable differences in satisfaction across the four European host countries. The comparison group found their junior year equally satisfying.

The students felt that it was worthwhile to study abroad for a variety of reasons, the most significant being gains in foreign language proficiency, perspectives gained on the United States, perspectives gained and knowledge acquired about the host country and its peoples, perspectives gained on the students' own lives, the opportunity to travel, and a break from previous routine. Of secondary importance were exposure to new teaching methods and subjects not offered at the home institution, career prospects, and exposure to other intellectual perspectives in their fields. Of tertiary importance were acquaintance with the students' family or ethnic heritage. The reasons given for the study abroad period being worthwhile are very similar to the reasons given for wanting to study abroad in the first place.

Students who felt that their year abroad was marked by academic accomplishment and growth, increased knowledge of the host country, lack of academic and personal problems, and a sense of integration into the university of the host country tended, not surprisingly, to be most satisfied with the study abroad experience.

It is important to identify, in turn, the individual and sojourn characteristics that are conducive to integration into the host university. The significant individual characteristics are the level of academic accomplishment, improvement in language proficiency, the students' desire to work cooperatively in group settings, and the amount of travel done while abroad. The one important sojourn characteristic that emerged was the student's housing arrangement while abroad, specifically, living in dormitory situations.

Academic accomplishment is, then, both an important independent variable and an important outcome variable in the study abroad experience. Paradoxically, students do not make academic achievements one of their top priorities before going abroad, but their satisfaction with the study abroad experience depends heavily on their sense of academic accomplishment. The data suggest that, along with language accomplishment, academic achievement is perhaps the most important dimension of the students' sojourn abroad. This is because

both factors enable the students to become integrated into the academic life of the host institution, an important component in determining the extent to which study abroad is a rewarding experience. To be sure, all but a small number of students consider the experience to have been very worthwhile. Yet in this context of very positive assessment by the students, desirable outcomes can be enhanced, and one important factor in improving the outcomes of study abroad is to ensure that academic accomplishment is maximized.

Reintegration into the Home University

What happened to the study abroad students after they returned to their home universities is not, strictly speaking, one of the outcomes of study abroad examined in this study. Yet it is so obviously an "outcome" in the experience of the study abroad group that it necessary to discuss it here.

Study abroad creates a rosy glow in students, but reintegration into the home university is another story. Although their academic horizons had broadened as a result of studying and living abroad, the study abroad students reported that about the only thing related to their overseas sojourn that they did at their home institution when they returned was to complete questionnaires. The returned study abroad students were enthusiastic and clearly felt "different" as a result of having been abroad, but the home institutions seemed to ignore their experiences and reintegration into the daily academic and social life of the home institution remains problematic. Ideally, reintegration should not be equated with "reabsorption;" rather, it should mean that the intellectual, academic, personal, and linguistic gains made by the students would be taken into account by the home institution so that the returned students could apply their newly gained proficiencies to the intellectual and social life of their home campus.

At a number of campuses, indeed, efforts are now underway to examine "articulation" problems and to facilitate the kind of continuity between study abroad and study-on-return (as well as pre-study abroad) that would both benefit both the returned students and contribute to the internationalization of their college or university by integrating study abroad into students' degree programs.

Chapter 8:
Looking Back on Study Abroad

The effects of study abroad experiences on the lives of participants after they complete their undergraduate studies are just as important as the immediate effects of the experiences, yet these effects are poorly understood. Do these experiences, indeed, have long-lasting effects? And if so, what is it about their experiences that alumni/ae perceive as having been influential? And finally, are there objective indicators to distinguish the behavior and attitudes of the alumni/ae from Americans who resemble them in significant respects but did not have study abroad experiences?

To address the fourth and final research question—"what are the long-term effects of the study abroad experience?"—biographical information was gathered from a sample of study abroad alumni/ae. Our resources necessitated limiting the sample to individuals residing in the United States at the time of the interview. The sample consisted of randomly selected persons who had participated in an education abroad program in one of the target western European countries at intervals of 5, 10, 15, and 20 years ago. Each of the 76 respondents completed a one-page profile questionnaire and a half-hour telephone and was interviewed in a half-hour telephone discussion.

At the time of the interview, the vast majority (92 percent) of the sample was fully employed, almost two-thirds in professional/technical occupations and less than one-third in managerial/administrative work roles. Two-thirds of the alumni/ae were married and one-third single or divorced. Three-fourths of those married had a family income of more than $35,000 a year, while only two-fifths of the single/divorced group earned over $35,000. Both marriage and child bearing tended to be delayed. Ten percent of the sample had foreign-born spouses.

Higher Education Aspirations, Expectations, and Attainments

All of the alumni/ae interviewed completed the bachelor's degree; also, 80 percent of the men and 64 percent of the women had continued into post-bachelor's degree work. (See Table 12; the two older and two younger cohorts

are collapsed to permit statistically valid analysis.) These gender differences correspond quite closely to the gender trends in American higher education. The older age grade males received their doctorates at an earlier age (28) than the older females (31), but this discrepancy vanishes in the younger age grades.

Table 12
Percentage Distribution of SAP Sample with Education Beyond Bachelor's Degree, by Generation and Sex

Age at Interview (Year Entered College)	Education Beyond Bachelor's Degree			
	None	**Some***	**Master's**	**Doctorate**
All 25-44 (1960-1979)	28.9	6.7	35.5	28.9
Males	19.4	3.2	38.7	38.7
Females	35.6	8.9	33.3	22.2
I. 40-44 (1960-1964)	26.7	6.4	20.0	46.7
Males	—	—	50.0	50.0
Females	26.4	8.1	9.1	45.5
II. 35-39 (1965-1969)	13.7	—	54.5	31.8
Males	9.1	—	45.5	45.5
Females	18.2	—	63.6	18.2
III. 30-34 (1970-1974)	29.6	14.9	33.3	22.2
Males	36.4	9.1	18.2	36.4
Females	25.0	18.7	43.8	12.5
IV. 25-29 (1975-1979)	58.3	—	25.0	16.7
Males	20.0	—	60.0	20.0
Females	85.7	8.9	—	13.3

* Formally enrolled in some post-bachelor's program but no degree earned.

Employment History and Work-Life

A very high proportion of the study abroad alumni/ae were, as indicated above, in work roles that are classified as "new middle class occupations," i.e., they were in either professional/technical or managerial/administrative positions. The percentage distribution of job type by gender and study abroad cohort is reported in Table 13, which shows that more men were in professional/technical

positions and more women in managerial/administrative ones. Yet what is of key interest here is not the particular occupational categories of the alumni/ae but the extent to which they incorporated their European experiences into their work roles.

Table 13
Percentage Distribution of Employment Category
by Gender and Study Abroad Cohort

		Gender		Cohort	
Employment Category	**Total**	**Male**	**Female**	**I&II**	**III&IV**
	(76)	(31)	(45)	(37)	(39)
NMC Occup.[A]	92.1	93.6	91.1	94.6	89.8
Prof./tech.[1]	61.8	71.0	55.5	64.9	59.0
Manag./admin.[2]	30.3	22.6	35.6	29.7	30.8
Other	7.9	6.4	8.9	5.4	10.2

[A] New middle class occupations (i.e. professional/technical and managerial/administrative positions)

[1] Professional, technical, and kindred workers

[2] Managers, officials, and proprietors except farm

Maximizers and minimalists. Two patterns emerge among the alumni/ae: there are the "maximizers," 45 out of 76, who incorporate their European study abroad and other significant transnational experiences into their career values and employment practices; and there are the "minimalists," 31 out of 76, who reported that their foreign experiences are valued in retrospect but are not appreciably relevant to their current work life. The characteristics of the maximizers are of special interest here.

There were almost equal proportions of men (58 percent) and women (60 percent) among the maximizers. Maximizers were slightly more frequent in the younger cohort (61 percent) than in the older one (57 percent). Greater differences emerged when the maximizers were compared to the minimalists in terms of the highest educational degree earned: 60 percent of those with advanced degrees were maximizers, but only 44 percent of the minimalists obtained advanced degrees. Also, a much higher proportion of maximizers were in professional/technical occupations (70 percent), as compared with 43 percent of the minimalists. Further analyses showed that the maximizers tended to be

25 to 34 year old males and 35 to 44 year old females, with no differences related to highest educational attainment; but minimalists tended to be older males with advanced degrees and younger females with bachelor's degrees only.

Types of maximizers. Five broad groupings of maximizers were identified: (a) those who had roles in educational institutions, (b) those with positions in transnational structures, (c) independent professionals, (d) maximizers of small chances in complex organizations, and (e) the deeply committed but situationally constrained.

(a) *Roles in educational institutions.* The growing interest in the post-World War II U.S. educational system in introducing an international dimension into teaching and research provided opportunities to maximizers at both the secondary and tertiary levels. An example of a secondary school teacher is an alumnus who studied abroad in Bordeaux, who now teaches social studies in a small city in a western prairie state and whose wife, whom he met in Bordeaux, teaches both Spanish and French there. About every three years they go abroad, concentrating on Western Europe, but also going farther afield to the Soviet Union and to the Eastern European countries. In his teaching, he tries hard to counteract the ethnocentrism that his students are subjected to in news coverage of world events.

Another example is an assistant professor of English in a church-related private college in the Middle West. Starting out with a study abroad experience in France, he proceeded to study Mandarin, spent time in Taiwan teaching English and absorbing a new culture, and finally embarked on graduate study in English at McGill University, where he enjoyed the bilingual/bicultural quality of Quebec. He continues to seek opportunities to travel and lecture abroad and is passionately interested in exploring and teaching students about the ways in which people in different cultures "use literature to communicate their positions on vital issues."

(b) *Positions in transnational structures.* One group of study abroad alumni/ae that emerged from the interviews obtained positions in organizations that are engaged in activities that interrelate the countries of the world.

Typically, the alumni/ae occupy intermediate professional/managerial positions rather than high-level political or policymaking positions. They have expertise in the language, norms, and power structure of their foreign counterparts, as well as some sophisticated understanding of the traditions and critical problems of a major world region.

One such alumnus is a member of the African regional staff of the World Bank, coordinating a program to control river blindness in eleven West African

countries. After a study abroad experience in France in the early 1960s, he became involved in the civil rights movement and then joined the Peace Corps as a volunteer teaching English and physical education in French-speaking Africa. His route to the World Bank included two master's degrees, one in economics at the University of Michigan and one in international relations at Johns Hopkins, several federal government jobs that involved frequent travel, and positions on the staffs first of a Congressman and then a Senator. The lasting effects of his study abroad experience, he thinks, are his language competence, an appreciation of the way the French think, and an understanding of French, and therefore also West African, political institutions.

(c) Independent professionals. This is a heterogeneous group, harder to capture in a few illustrations; nevertheless, the following example should be illuminating:

This study abroad alumna is a distinguished musical composer and performing artist, resident all her life in New England, but widely traveled in pursuit of her career. Her initial study abroad was in Freiburg, West Germany, after concluding her undergraduate studies and before taking her master's degree, but when she was already intensively studying composition and piano. While in Freiburg she lived in private lodgings to create the situation in which she would best learn German, and ever since she has made extensive professional use of her knowledge of German. As a teacher, she urges both her private pupils and her college students to go abroad. In her private life, she is open to anything international or foreign.

(d) Maximizers of small chances in complex organizations. Two differing modes of maximizers of small chances for participating were found, often part-time or occasionally, in cross-cultural roles.

One such pattern is to select a facet of the cross-cultural that is accessible and attractive. An example is a woman of considerable status in an old line federal bureacuratic structure, the U.S. Customs Service. As an undergraduate, she majored in French literature and European history and studied in her junior year, at the beginning of the 1970s, at the University of Bordeaux. Since the mid-70s, she has been employed by the U.S. Customs Service and has advanced to the senior ranks, a situation in which she encounters strangers from all foreign lands at entry checkpoints. For her, these routine encounters are continuing "small chances" for personally and professionally renewing an interest in the world of diverse cultures. In addition, her knowledge of French led to her selection to represent the Customs Service at a drug conference in the Ivory Coast.

The second genre of maximizers of small chances might be called improvised mediators. As the world penetrates more deeply into American communities, the managerial leadership of local companies, state government agencies, civic

groups, and educational systems are relative newcomers to international transactions and interpersonal contact with foreign counterparts. As a result, alumni/alumnae acquire a growing number of improvised roles as translators, interpreters, ad hoc consultants, or temporary special assistants to senior administrators. Some have been brought in to check on the accuracy of translations of negotiated contracts, to make the arrangements for visiting foreign delegations, or to travel abroad as interpreters for senior officials. All welcomed these opportunities to adapt their cross-cultural repertoires to fit their organization's new necessities in the global political economy.

(e) The deeply committed but situationally constrained. Finally, there are maximizers who are not satisfied with the "small chances" available to them to use their cross-cultural skills. They are actively seeking or plan to obtain jobs with greater opportunities to utliize their earlier transnational educational experiences and ongoing cross-cultural experiences.

While all the alumni/ae have suffered periods of dissatisfaction in their jobs, what distinguishes the maximizers from the minimalists is the fact that such dissatisfaction is directly related to their inability to utilize their cross-cultural repertoire as much as they would like. An illustration may be useful. One man spent a junior year in Goettingen in the early 1970s and later obtained a law degree. After some years in various legal positions, he became a teacher of German in a high school. At the time of the interview, he had a high school teaching job in which he was not teaching German and was considering a move to another school where he might again do so.

What seems to us most important about the long-term effects of the study abroad experience is that all of those interviewed were either maximizers or minimalists: none of them were negativists. Our findings give eloquent testimony to the powerful impact of the study abroad experience and to the variety of opportunities for the implementation of continuing international interests.

Chapter 9:
The Significance of the Study's Findings

Policy and Research Implications

The objectives of the SAEP when it was initially conceived in 1982 have in large measure been achieved. Both the U.S. and European participants wanted to know if the investment of staff, funds, and other resources to conduct study abroad and exchange programs are justified by their contributions to students' international education. However, whereas the Europeans tended to be more interested in the contribution of experience abroad to students functioning professionally in other countries and cultures, the U.S. interest was more on students' gaining a greater knowledge of and concern for other countries and international issues as well as enhanced foreign language proficiency.

This concluding chapter identifies the major implications of the SAEP in terms of policy issues relating to study abroad for study abroad professionals, higher education institutions, and public and private funding agencies. It further seeks to set forth issues and aspects of study abroad, both highly concrete and more general, which call for additional research in order to expand our understanding of study abroad and its role in the international education of Americans.

The Findings in the Context of our Times and Society.

This report on the U.S. experience in the SAEP is timely for several reasons. First is that study abroad is one of the most rapidly expanding fields in American higher education, and yet there has hitherto been little systematic research on its outcomes for students. Second, the report is timely because it documents the effectiveness of study abroad in significantly strengthening students' knowledge of other countries and their languages in a period of widening realization of the international interdependence of the U.S. and the resultant need for people to be internationally educated.

The timeliness of this study also relates the important contribution of study abroad to some of the goals of a liberal education in a period of redefinition and reaffirmation of these goals. For example, study abroad returnees are more independent-minded, intellectually inclined, and able to cope with ambiguity

than they were before going abroad. It is striking that in their period abroad these students achieved a number of the goals of a liberal education in terms of personal and intellectual development.

While the focus of the project has been on international experience and education, it is relevant to the accelerating cultural diversity within the United States. To function successfully within this increasingly diverse nation and culture, more Americans must have cross-cultural skills and sensitivity. The study abroad experience, by developing these skills, is important in preparing students not only to function effectively in the "global village," but also as members of the more and more diversified American society.

Policy Implications

Introduction. What are the implications of the SAEP findings for policy? Should more students study abroad? What goals and criteria should govern their selection, predeparture orientation, program activities and content while abroad, and reentry? Should study abroad play a larger role in internationalizing colleges and universities, and how might this be achieved? Does study abroad advance the national interest and hence merit public support?

While findings of the project provide insights on many of the above questions, it should be emphasized that these findings may not apply to study abroad programs not sharing the characteristics of those examined in the project. Also, institutions interested in evaluating their own study abroad activities should not mechanically apply the instruments developed for the SAEP but should pick out those items which best fit their own circumstances and concerns.

Some Findings and Issues. The SAEP showed that students who study abroad are much more interested in international affairs after this experience than before, and their knowledge of the host country increases dramatically. While these findings might be viewed as mandating a major expansion in study abroad participation, such a conclusion is far too simplistic and would probably produce disappointing results. Insofar as students choosing to study abroad tend not to be typical of American undergraduates, as pointed up by the SAEP, efforts to expand student numbers, without taking into account the factors that are essential to a successful experience, might be counterproductive.

The following subsections attempt to deal with the implications of the SAEP findings for the questions: who should study abroad, recruitment and selection, program design, and how students' international learning through study abroad can be maximized. Certain follow-up activities in Europe and in the U.S. whose initiation was significantly aided/prompted by SAEP findings are also described.

Who Should Study Abroad? The SAEP findings show that study abroad programs for Americans typically enroll students from professional level parents, students who are academic achievers, and a high proportion of students who have already been abroad. The findings also show that close to three-fourths of the American SAEP students were majors in the humanities, social sciences, or business, and close to two-thirds were female. These findings should be regarded as descriptive, not prescriptive. Among students surveyed in the SAEP sufficient numbers did not fit the foregoing descriptors to affirm that such students can study abroad successfully and gain from the experience.

With regard to academic ability, because the programs reviewed in the SAEP overwhelmingly required a strong academic record for admission, the SAEP cannot provide guidelines on enrolling students who are uneven academically. However, the findings that the students who felt they performed well academically also learned most about their host country and were most satisfied with their experience abroad suggests that study abroad should probably not include students who are less able academically. If they are included, they should probably have special orientation and other programming.

Our findings on the personal characteristics of study abroad students also have implications for who should study abroad. It is striking that the study abroad students tended to be risk-takers, more critical of aspects of the United States, and less typically mainstream than the comparison group students. The latter are much more committed to the immediate goals of their own financial survival, more task-oriented, and more concerned with getting their degree and moving on to a job.

One faces the dilemma that it is probably the students who are already most international in their interests, more independent and analytical in their thinking, and relatively well-equipped with coping and cross-cultural skills who elect to study abroad, and by the same token may have less to gain from it than students choosing to stay home. Most of the latter, for whom the "value added" is likely to be greatest, may not have conceived of themselves in study abroad, especially in programs which maximize interaction with the foreign culture and people.

Also significant to study abroad participation are the SAEP findings which suggest that many students choose not to study abroad because they doubt it will be relevant to their major or to their future career, or they fear it may prolong their studies. If the foregoing concerns can be addressed, more "mainstream" students might choose to study abroad, especially if their faculty advisors were more encouraging, particularly in the sciences and professional fields.

Study Abroad Recruitment and Selection. For study abroad to enroll more students, selection can no longer be mainly through self-selection but

should involve proactive strategies. These related to sexual stereotyping and career counseling, information dissemination, faculty support, reducing perceived deterrents, expanding the pool of internationally-concerned students, and offering more programs which attract the more mainstream undergraduates.

To reduce the sex and discipline imbalances in student participation, male students and students in the sciences, engineering, and other professional fields should be given much more encouragement to study abroad. Staff members in college career counseling offices should inform students about the relevance of a significant experience abroad to an increasing number of careers. U.S. colleges and universities should incorporate a study or internship abroad experience in the degree programs of students majoring in the sciences and professional fields, as is increasingly common in Western European higher education. Students should be informed about study abroad opportunities at the college level while still in high school so they can take this information into account when deciding where to apply for college. Students majoring in disciplines with heavy requirements of sequenced courses, such as engineering, also need to plan early if they are to study abroad as part of their college degree program.

Proactive recruitment should also involve much more effort by faculty members, as is documented by project findings. They showed that 50 percent of students not interested in study abroad saw it as unnecessary for their academic program while 40 percent viewed it as inappropriate. Faculty members who are well informed and enthusiastic about study abroad can and should counter such views if more students are to be motivated to seek this experience. Faculty members can also help students plan for study abroad so that it does not involve delaying their graduation, a concern of 46 percent of the respondent.

Proactive recruitment clearly should address what 69 percent of the comparison group identified as influencing their lack of interest in study abroad: its cost. Too often, as with the comparison group, study abroad is perceived as being much more expensive than the same period at the home campus, when this is often not the case. This is not to deny the importance of financial assistance, however, and indeed a higher proportion of the study abroad than of the comparison group students received such support.

Because students who choose to study abroad tend to be internationally concerned, the expansion of study abroad participation calls for identifying and/or producing more such students. In this regard the SAEP study abroad students shared the following characteristics:

- Strong interest in current events, other countries, and international affairs

- Prior experience abroad, typically 1–2 months at age 16 (62 percent of SAEP students)
- Prior foreign language study
- A high level of motivation to experience another culture, live in and gain more understanding of another country, and use of improve foreign language skills

The policy implications of the above include the following: High school study abroad programs should be expanded, and foreign language instructions should give students a working proficiency and motivation to study abroad. Colleges and universities should give all undergraduates a basic knowledge of at least one other country or world region and cross-cultural skills for dealing with foreign people and cultures. Interaction between study abroad and foreign students, a much neglected resource for international education, should be encouraged and fostered.

To recruit more mainstream Americans, study abroad programs should be offered that provide only limited or partial immersion in the host culture. These might provide a more protected, even somewhat American style setting, even though this may mean less international education. Programs that enable students to meet some of their academic requirements while abroad might also recruit more of the students who normally are less likely to study abroad.

Program Design and Maximizing Student Learning.
SAEP findings suggest that the following program characteristics, activities, or policies are important in enhancing students' international learning:

- Early student planning, careful preparation, and orientation of students
- High standards required for students' academic performance and provision for continuous learning about the host country and its language while abroad
- Maximum integration of students into the host culture
- Opportunities for returnees to capitalize and build on their learning acquired abroad, including foreign language skills, thereby helping to reduce their sense of sense of alienation so common on reentry

Some National Policy Needs. The preceding recommendations have mostly addressed institutions of postsecondary education. The following recommendations, however, require broader public support and action for implementation:

(a) The national leadership concerned about the urgent need for internationally educated Americans should be made aware of the key findings of the SAEP: Namely, that for American undergraduates, a significant study abroad experience dramatically strengthens their international knowledge and concern, and far exceeds that achieved by comparison group students who do not study abroad

(b) In keeping with this finding, college and university presidents, professional associations, foundations, and other organizations involved with education and international studies should give major recognition and priority to serious undergraduate study abroad in enunciating educational goals and in allocating resources

(c) Because cost can be an important deterrent to study abroad for many undergraduates, federal financial aid to students should provide incentive grants towards study abroad costs, with matching requirements of the home campuses, in order to encourage and accord recognition to their commitment

(d) For students at the high school and lower division college level, cross-cultural and international studies programs should be encouraged and strengthened which, like high school study abroad, fire students' interest in other countries and prepare and motivate the students to study abroad

(e) Federal and other funding should target study abroad in the non-Western and developing world

Follow-up to the SAEP. In both Western Europe and the United States, the SAEP has been important in stimulating and contributing to the development of further activity. In Western Europe, the very positive findings of the SAEP's evaluation of intra-European student exchanges funded under the EC, helped make the case for ERASMUS, the European Action Scheme for Mobility of University Students. Under this program, the EC funds the development of cooperative exchanges between EC higher education institutions with the aim of enabling ten percent of higher education students in the European Community to study in another EC country, a goal for 1992.

The SAEP follow-up in the U.S., the so-called "Articulation Project," encouraged policies and programs at the eight participating institutions (the original SAEP four plus four more) that give study abroad a more central role in internationalizing undergraduate education. The project's name is derived from its emphasis on articulating students' study abroad experience with their home campus studies so that, rather than being apart from their degree studies, study abroad is an integral part of them. This Ford Foundation-funded project

will be reported in a forthcoming publication comprising case studies of the activities of each of the eight institutions.

Implications for Future Research

The Study Abroad Evaluation Project has shown the importance of more research on various SAEP concerns and on issues relating to study abroad, which were not a focus of the project. In addition, wider concerns at the institutional and national levels require much more examination and understanding if study abroad is to deliver in ways that the SAEP findings have shown are feasible.

Related research needs that were not sufficiently addressed by SAEP findings include identifying those aspects of study abroad programs and student profiles that correlate most with international learning by study abroad students: sex, age, parental status and income, major field of study, etc. The role of faculty in advising and planning study abroad should be further studied.

The need for research on study abroad programs that differ substantially from the SAEP model is increasingly urgent as study abroad enrolls more and more students. These other models include programs for shorter time periods, elsewhere than in Western Europe, involving limited cultural immersion, and admitting students representing a spectrum of academic ability. Still other important issues calling for study include: for students who do not study abroad, what would be an equivalent experience in international education? If some study abroad programs are considered unsuccessful, what are the criteria used for such a judgment? What kinds of programs and policies might be more effective in recruiting students to study abroad from underrepresented groups such as blacks, males, science and engineering majors, or students from disadvantaged socioeconomic backgrounds?

The increasing responsibilities imposed on colleges and universities by the growing international interdependence of the world community challenge faculty and administrators to examine a number of broader issues and research questions, such as the following:

1. What does an "internationalized" college or university mean and why is it important?
2. What are the implications of "internationalizing" an institution's programs and curricula? What are the costs and benefits?
3. How will "internationalization" affect the content of academic disciplines and disciplinary research?
4. How and to what extent will the entire enterprise of international educational exchange be studied and evaluated? How will scholarly enquiry be supported?

5. How will the results of systematic, scholarly enquiry into study abroad be used to inform policy and future developments?

This list of questions indicates the breadth and complexity of the research agenda that needs to be developed. In order for knowledge to advance in the area of international educational exchange, the cooperation of scholars from a variety of fields will be necessary, including the sciences, social sciences, and humanities.

Since empirical research in this area tends to be driven more from pragmatic than theoretical considerations, it will be necessary to develop a theory to help guide the formulation and operationalization of research questions. It will be necessary to draw on a range of empirical and intellectual traditions. If the Study Abroad Evaluation Project, in addition to blazing new terrain and documenting the importance of study abroad to the international education of undergraduates, points up the urgency of more research, it will have rendered an important service to the field.

References

Abrams, I. (1960) *Study Abroad, New Dimensions in Higher Education: Some Newer Developments.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Adler, P.S. (1965). "The Transitional Experience: An Alternative View of Culture Shock." *Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 15,* 13-23

Allport, G. (1955). *Theories of Perception and the Concept of Structure.* New York: Wiley.

Bandura, A. (1982) "Self-Efficacy in Human Agency." *American Psychologist, 37.* 122-147.

Barrows, T., Ager, S.M., Bennett, M.F., Brown, H.I., Clark, J.L.D., Harris, L.G., and Klein, S.F. (1981) *College Students' Knowledge and Beliefs: A Survey of Global Understanding.* New Rochelle, NY: Change Magazine Press

Block, J. (1982). "Assimilation, Accommodation, and the Dynamics of Personality Development." *Child Development,* 53. 281-295.

Brislin, R.W. (1981) *Cross-Cultural Encounters.* New York: Pergamon.

Burn, B. (1980) *Expanding the International Dimension of Higher Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Burn, B. and Briggs, A. (1985) *Study Abroad: A European and American Perspective on Organization and Impact of Study Abroad.* Amsterdam: European Institute of Education and Policy Study.

Campbell, R. and Schnell, S. (1987). "Language Conservation." *The Annals of the American Academy,* 177-185.

Carlson, J.S. and Widaman, K.F. (1988). "The Effects of Study Abroad During College on Attitudes Toward Other Cultures." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations. 12,* 1-17.

Carlson, J.S. and Yachimowicz, D. (1987). *Evaluation of the University of California's Education Abroad Program: The 1986-87 Participant Questionnaire.* University of California: Santa Barbara.

Caresello, C. and Greiser, J (1976). "How College Students Change During Study Abroad." *College Student Journal, 10.* 276-278

Church, A.T. (1982). "Sojourner Adjustment." *Psychological Bulletin, 91.* 540-572.

Coelho-Oudegeest, M. (1971). *Cross-Cultural Counseling.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin.

David, K.H. (1971). "Culture Shock and the Development of Self-Awareness." *Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy*, 4, p. 44-48.

Deutsch, S.E. (1970). *International Education and Exchange: A Sociological Analysis.* Cleveland: The Case Western Reserve University Press.

Farnham, A. and Bochner, S. (1982). "Social Difficulty in a Foreign Culture: An Empirical Analysis of Culture Shock." In S. Bochner (Ed.), *Culture in Contact.* New York: Pergamon.

Festinger, L. (1957). *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance.* Evanston, IL: Row-Peterson.

Harter, S. (1978). "Effectance Motivation Reconsidered: Toward a Comprehensitve Model of Self-Worth." In R. Leaky (Ed.), *The Development of Self.* New York: Academic Press.

Harter, S. (1986). Competence as a Dimension of Self-Evaluation: Toward a Comprehensive Model of Self-Worth. In R. Leaky (Ed.) *The Development of Self.* New York: Academic Press.

Hull, F. (1978). *Foreign Students in the United States of America: Coping Behavior with the Education Environment.* New York: Praeger

Hunt, J. McV. *Intelligence and Experience.* New York: Ronald.

Kelman, H. (1975). "Intercultural Interchanges: Some Contributions from Theories of Attitude Change." In W. Coplin and J.M. Rochester (Eds.) *A Multimethod Introduction to International Politics.* Chicago: Markham.

Klineberg, O. (1981). "The Role of International University Exchanges." In S. Bochner (Ed.) *The Mediating Person.* Cambridge: Shenkman.

Klineberg, O. and Hull, F. (1979). *At a Foreign University.* New York: Praeger.

Lachman, M.E. (1986). "Personal Control in Later Life: Stability, Change, and Cognitive Correlates." In M.M. Baltes & P.B. Baltes (Eds.) *The Psychology and Control of Aging.* Hillside, NJ: Erlbaum.

Luria, A.R. (1976). *Cognitive Development: Its Cultural and Social Foundation* (trans. by M. Cole). Cambridge, MA: Harvard.

McGuigan, F.J. (1984). "Psychological Changes Related to Intercultural Experiences." *Psychological Reports, 4*. 55-60.

Morris, R.T. (1960). *The Two-Way Mirror: National Status in Foreign Students' Adjustment*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Piaget, J. (1950). *The Psychology of Intelligence* (Trans. by M. Piercy and D.E. Barlyne). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Pool, I.(1965). "Effects of Cross-National Contact on National and International Images." In H.C. Kelman (Ed.). *International Behavior: A Social Psychological Analysis*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Prater, C.H., Barutia, R., Larkin, B.D. and Weaver, H.D. (1980). *Final Report of the Foreign Language Review Committee*. University of California, Santa Barbara.

Rosenthal, R., and Rosnow, R.L. (1975). *The Volunteer Subject*. New York: Wiley

Sanford, N. (1962). "Higher Education as a Field of Study." In N. Sanford (Ed.) *The American College*. New York: Wiley.

Sell, D.K. (1983). "Attitude Change in Foreign Study Participants." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 7*. 131-147.

Smith, H.D. (1955) "Do Intercultural Experiences Affect Attitudes?" *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 51*. 469-477.

Spalding, S., and Flack, M.J. (1976). *The World's Students in the United States: A Review and Evaluation of Research on Foreign Students*. New York: Praeger

Useem, J., Donoghue, J.D., and Useem, R.H. (1963). "Men in the Middle of the Third Culture: The Roles of American and Non-Western People in Cross-Cultural Administration." *Human Organization, 22*. 169-179.

Walton, B.J. (1988). "Foreign Student Exchange in Perspective: What the Research Tells Us." *International Education and Cultural Exchange, 3*. 1-14.

Weaver, H., ed. (1987) *Research on U.S. Students Abroad: A Bibliography with Abstracts*. Council on International Educational Exchange, University of California Education Abroad Program, Institute of International Education, and NAFSA

Appendix I:
European Members of the SAEP Team

Britta Baron, Assistant to the President of the Board and to the Secretary General, German Academic Exchange Service, Bonn

Ladislav Cerych, Director, European Institute of Education and Social Policy, Paris

Susan Opper, Associate Director for Research, Education Abroad Program, University of California; formerly Research Associate for the SAEP at European Institute of Education and Social Policy, Paris and Brussels

Denyse Saab, Project Assistant, European Institute of Education and Social Policy, Paris

Alan Smith, Director, ERASMUS Bureau, European Institute of Education and Social Policy, Brussels

Wolfgang Steube, Project Assistant, Center for Research on Higher Education and Work, Gesamthochschule-Universitat Kassel

Ulrich Teichler, Center for Research on Higher Education and Work, Gesamthochschule-Universitat Kassel

Appendix II: Occasional Papers on International Educational Exchange

Editorial Board

Chair: Stephen Cooper, Louisiana State University
Editor: Nelda S. Crowell, American Graduate School of International Management
Edwin A. Battle, Institute of International Education
Barbara B. Burn, University of Massachusetts—Amherst
William W. Cressey, Georgetown University
Jon O. Heise, University of Michigan
Gail Hochhauser, American Association of State Colleges and Universities
Joseph Hickey, Council on International Educational Exchange
Maryélise Lamet, University of Massachusetts—Amherst
Sterling Lamet, University of Massachusetts—Amherst
Paula Spier, Antioch University
Henry Weaver, University of California

Guidelines for Submission of Papers

The Occasional Papers on International Educational Exchange promulgate noteworthy scholarship and serve as a forum for the dissemination of provocative thinking in the field of international educational exchange. The papers address issues of interest to academics and professionals involved with a wide variety of activities in the field.

The Occasional Papers appear in two series:

- The **Research Series** makes available contributions to scholarly research in the field of international education; any competent research methodology—whether historical, analytical, or experimental—may serve as the basis of the research reported.
- The **Forum Series** focuses on contributions to the development of new or existing ideas in the field of international education; papers

may be texts of speeches, essays, or descriptions of projects, and should reflect the ideas or experiences of practitioners in international education.

Submission of Manuscripts

CIEE invites researchers and practitioners to submit manuscripts for possible publication as an Occasional Paper on International Educational Exchange in either the Forum or the Research Series. Manuscripts should follow these guidelines:

1. Two copies of a typed, double-spaced manuscript should be submitted. If return of the manuscript is requested, a stamped, self-addressed envelope must be included.
2. The manuscript should include a title page (with the name and address of the author, date of submission, and the number of pages submitted) and an abstract of no more than one page.
3. Manuscript pages should be numbered sequentially (excluding the title page). Numbering should include appendices and bibliography.
4. The length of the manuscript should generally be at least ten typed pages and no more than fifty pages.
5. The paper should be accompanied by appendices and a bibliography, as appropriate.
6. The manuscript should follow the basic style outlined in a recognized style book, such as the *Modern Language Association Style Sheet*, *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, or *Chicago Manual of Style*.
7. The writer should indicate whether the document is available on diskette in a word processor format, giving specifics on the format.

Mail manuscript submissions to: Stephen Cooper, Chair, CIEE Editorial Board, c/o Publications Department, Council on International Educational Exchange, 205 East 42nd Street, New York, NY 10017.

Review and Selection Process

Members of CIEE's editorial board consider all submissions and make recommendations to the chair of that board. Ordinarily the author's identity is masked in the review process. Selected manuscripts usually undergo further revision by the author and by the editor. CIEE holds the copyright on published papers.

Previous Titles

Since 1965, the Council on International Educational Exchange has published 28 occasional papers on a variety of subjects in the field of international education:

1. *Problems in Relations with Foreign Universities* by Stephen A. Freeman (1965)
2. *The Overseas Director* with articles by William H. Allaway and Stephen P. Koff (1965)
3. *Selection of Participants* by John A. Wallace (1965)
4. *Why Study Abroad* by Irwin Abrams (1965)
5. *Academic Study Abroad: Its Present Status* by J. Ralph Murray (1965)
6. *National Differences in the Approach to Knowledge—Implications for the Planning of Exchange Programs* with articles by Joseph A. Lauwerys, Michio Nagai, and Harold Taylor (1967)
7. *Selecting Personnel for Overseas Programs* with articles by Sven Lundstedt and Theodore L. McEvoy (1967)
8. *Teacher Education: The World Dimension* by Frank H. Klassen (1967)
9. *High School Exchange—Does Form Follow Function?* by Norman H. Wilson (1967)
10. *The Student Third Culture* with articles by Ruth H. Useem and George V. Coelho (1967)
11. *The University and International Education* by Robert W. Hartle (1968)
12. *The Developing Relationship between Sending Institutions and Receiving Institutions: Their Problems, Significance, and Potentials* by Frederico Perez Castro and Enrique Suarez de Puga (1967)
13. *The Selection of American Undergraduate Students on the American College Campus for Participation in Study Programs Overseas* by E. Gwen Gardner (1967)
14. *Research in Educational Exchange Problems: Step One—Defining Our Problem* by John E. Bowman (1967)
15. *Evaluation of Undergraduate Programs* by Allan O. Pfnister (1969)
16. *Improving the Educational Quality of Study Abroad Programs: Can Standards be Established?* by Allan O. Pfnister (1970)
17. *Toward Improved Franco-American University Exchanges* by Roger D. Masters (1971)
18. *Education and the Japan-America Tie in the Mid-'70s* by Marius B. Jansen (1974)
19. *Advisor's Guide to Study Abroad* by Cecelia C. Baumann (1975)

68

20. *The American Undergraduate, Off-Campus and Overseas: A Study of the Educational Validity of Such Programs* by W. Frank Hull IV, Walter H. Lemke, Jr., and Richard Ting-ku Houang (1977)
21. *Evaluating Academic Programs Abroad: The CIEE Project* by Irwin Abrams and Francis H. Heller (1978)
22. *Hallmarks of Successful Programs in the Developing World* with articles by William H. Allaway, Joseph W. Elder, Joe K. Fugate, and Diane K. Snell (1987)
23. *International Education: What is It? A Taxonomy of International Education of U.S. Universities* by Stephen Arum (1987)
24. *Educating American Undergraduates Abroad: The Development of Study Abroad Programs by American Colleges and Universities* by John E. Bowman (1987)
25. *Hallmarks of Successful International Business Programs* with articles by Jeffrey S. Arpan, Marshall Geer, Paul McCracken, and Jerry Wind (1988)
26. *The Contribution of International Educational Exchange to the International Education of Americans: Projections for the Year 2000* by Barbara B. Burn (1990)
27. *The Travel Journal: An Assessment Tool for Overseas Study* by Nancy Taylor (1990)
28. *Study Abroad: The Experience of American Undergraduates in Western Europe and the United States* by Jerry S. Carlson, Barbara B. Burn, John Useem, and David Yachimowicz (1991)

Occasional Papers on International Educational Exchange are available from:

Publications Department
Council on International Educational Exchange
205 East 42nd Street, New York, NY 10017